

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/487,265	01/19/2000	Toshiki Mori	826.1587/JDH 2955 EXAMINER	
21171	7590 01/30/2004			
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			ROBINSON BOYCE, AKIBA K	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3623	
			DATE MAILED: 01/30/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-7	Application No.	Applicant(s)	pplicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/487,265	MORI ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
<i>,</i> *	Akiba K Robinson-Boyce	3623			
CThe MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 12 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply n places the applica	/ to a tion in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or		
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF) 	Brief must be filed within the pe				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancellingNOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	s.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			ind an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-27</u> .			•		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No (s)- ≤	= /			
10.☐ Other:	SUPERVISORY	R. HAFIZ PATENT EXAMINER Y CENTER DEED			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Oliver does disclose the ratio information through the EV analyzer program in the computer in col. 8, lines 21-29. Here, Oliver discloses that the percent complete information can be determined and displayed. This percent complete information represents the ratio of persons who have completed the respectively assigned parts of the job. The applicant also argues that Oliver does not dsclose the receipt of a reply message of each of a plurality of receivers who do job in a group, and obtains information indicating whether the assigned part of the job had been completed or that the control unit of the message processing apparatus calculates a ratio of receivers who completed the respectively assigned parts of the job to all of the plurality of receivers of the message who do the the job. However, Oliver does disclose the previously mentioned limitations since Oliver discloses the receipt of a reply message in Col. 9, lines 1-9. Here, Oliver discloses that the operator of the system may click on the screen to display a determined response [reply message] such as percent complete, which indicates the percentage of the project that has been completed [assigned part of the job had been completed], based on the ratio of earned value to the total project baseline. Since the percentage completed is based on the ratio of earned value to the total project baseline, this ratio represents the ratio of completed assigned parts of the job by the receivers. The applicant also argues that Oliver fails to disclose a message being sent to a person assigned a job and the person responding with the completion state of the job. However, the message is represented by Col. 7. lines 61-62 where initial presentation of EV information is made after task data is obtained. After this is done, Oliver shows that responses such as the percent complete is determined in col. 9, lines 1-9 which also represents the job completion messages. In addition, the reply-confirmation button in Nakaoka in combination with the message limitation of Oliver discloses the limitations of claim 4. In addition, the Beck identifier represents preventing or limiting a transfer since it is not possible to transfer data without accessing it.